

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY
LOUISVILLE DIVISION
CRIMINAL ACTION NO. 3:17-CR-170-CHB-CHL**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

JOSEPH R. WILLIS, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

This matter came before the undersigned on January 17, 2019 for a suppression hearing on the pending Motions to Suppress (DNs 109, 114). The following were present:

FOR THE UNITED STATES:	Randy Ream, counsel; Elizabeth N. Jones Brown, counsel
FOR DEFENDANT C. JONES:	Clifton J. Jones; Ramon McGee, retained counsel
FOR DEFENDANT D. RICE:	Dontay L. Rice; Keith E. Kameinsh, retained counsel
FOR DEFENDANT ESTEY:	Eric R. Estey; Larry D. Simon, appointed counsel
FOR DEFENDANT TAYLOR:	Dandre L. Taylor; Philip M Longmeyer, appointed counsel
FOR DEFENDANT SMITH:	Odell P. Smith, Jr.; Rob Eggert, retained counsel
FOR DEFENDANT FREEMAN:	William C. Freeman; Catherine J. Kamish, appointed counsel
FOR DEFENDANT HALL:	James E. Hall; Mark J. Wettle, appointed counsel
FOR DEFENDANT HEISER:	Chad. J. Heiser; Stephen H. Miller, appointed counsel
FOR DEFENDANT C. RICE:	Clarence W. Rice, Jr.; John Casey McCall, retained counsel
FOR DEFENDANT WILLIS:	Joseph R. Willis; Jonathan S. Ricketts, appointed counsel

FOR DEFENDANT THOMPSON

Tonika Lavon Thompson;¹ James A.
Earhart, appointed counsel

COURT REPORTER:

Dena Legg

The undersigned first held oral argument on whether the Defendants were entitled to an evidentiary hearing under *Franks v. Delaware*, 438 U.S. 154 (1978). The undersigned found that the Defendants were not entitled to an evidentiary hearing for reasons that will be set forth in a separate order. The undersigned then held oral argument on the Motions to Suppress (DNs 109, 114).

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the undersigned will take the Motions to Suppress (DNs 109, 114) under advisement.

cc: Counsel of Record

:5.0

¹ Defendant Thompson was not present at the start of the suppression hearing because she believed the hearing started at 10:30 AM. However, she arrived shortly after the hearing began. Her attorney Mr. Earhart indicated that she had no objection to the Court going forward with the hearing in her absence and that until her arrival, he would serve as her representative.